

Rollins College Rollins Scholarship Online

Professional Standards Committee Minutes

College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports

9-11-2007

Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 11, 2007

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee

Follow this and additional works at: http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps

Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Professional Standards Committee Meeting, Tuesday, September 11, 2007" (2007). *Professional Standards Committee Minutes*. Paper 89.
http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_ps/89

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes and Reports at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Professional Standards Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact wzhang@rollins.edu.

Professional Standards Committee
Approved Minutes from September 11, 2007
12:30 p.m. CSS 249

Next meeting: October 2, 2007 CSS 249

The meeting was convened at 12:30 p.m. in CSS 249 by the chair, Wendy Brandon.
Faculty members present were: Julie Carrington, Mario D'Amato, Fiona Harper, Alicia Homrich, Susan Libby, and Anca Voicu. Dean Laurie Joyner was also present.

1. Agenda Items

A. Old Business

Approval of minutes from April 17, 2007
PSC Summary report 2006-2007
CIE remaining business
Meeting with Finance and Services for Travel Policy ideas
At-Large PSC member election
Review of April 17, 2007 minutes for PSC remaining work
By-Law changes not showing up in Faculty Handbook.

B. New Business

Recording secretary: Julie Carrington
Student Representative: Walker Hamby
New PSC members: Susan Libby, Anca Voicu, Fiona Harper, Julie Carrington
Meeting times for all semester
Early Proposal Grant Awards review and dinner date
Some changes to forms
Service Learning and Petters grant formats
Agenda Items from Faculty to PSC
Stop tenure clock for caregivers and new parents
Handbook revisions for FEC
Promotion without tenure policy
Executive Committee 2006-07 Review of Tenure/Promotion for consistency (Formal/informal evaluation inconsistent wording)

2. Old Business

- I. Approval of minutes from April 17, 2007. As the header on minutes states that they are approved, we assume the approval was done online after the April meeting.
- II. The (unfinished) draft 2006-2007 PSC summary was distributed. W.Brandon asks that M. D'Amato and A. Homrich look it over as they are the only other returning committee members.
- III. There are some remaining issues with the CIE forms.
 - W. Brandon will contact Les Lloyd about ensuring that faculty have an opportunity to comment on a particular course and will make sure Judy Schmalstig on FEC is aware.

- Many of the changes made last year were implemented but some issues should still be revisited, e.g., how can we encourage more narrative from students without alienating them to the point where they either focus on the negative or refuse to fill out the forms at all.
 - We need to consider Paul Harris's suggested summary form (page 16 on the draft summary.) It is agreed that the percentiles serve no purpose and, in fact, falling into the 10th percentile might be simply because the instructor was teaching something students didn't want to know, e.g., diversity issues.
 - F. Harper questioned the committee's decision that we didn't want averages (see number 6 on page 15 of the draft summary). She notes that the averages can be helpful if there's a contentious issue.
 - FEC only gets summary reports; one for each class (page 16) and one semester summary (page 17.) The committee does get access to the evaluations online.
 - M. D'Amato asked what the semester summary accomplishes. We agreed that there is actually no additional information and the faculty comments will be attached to a course, not a semester so we drop the page 17 form.
 - In summary, we drop the page 17 semester summary, make sure there is an opportunity for faculty to comment and we eliminate the percentiles.
- IV. We still need another at-large member – to be determined at the next faculty meeting.

3. New Business – April minutes suggest remaining work from last year.

- I. Application procedures and forms for various faculty grants are inconsistent and unclear. There is no central website where all applications could be made available.
- A. Homrich will talk to Tom Lairson about clarifying the format for Petters grant applications. She noted that there is a website with a news release on the grants but not with information on applying. The site is <http://news.rollins.edu/07internationalizationrcn.shtml>.
 - W. Brandon suggested that when other grants have an international component, the applicant should be encouraged to also apply for a Petters grant.
 - S. Libby noted that, while other grants are specifically teaching related, the Petters are for travel for any reason.
 - M. D'Amato clarified that every faculty member gets up to \$3000 every three years to travel and other internationalization grants could be used for, e.g., bringing in a speaker from Peru. There are two separate grant types, the Petters and the internationalization grants.
 - W. Brandon mentioned that Paul Stephenson would like to have someone sit in when the PSC goes through grant applications to see how it is done. She also wondered if all of these grants shouldn't be handled by the PSC or at least by some elected body.

- Dean Joyner noted that the same issue exists for other grants, for example, the Service Learning grants. They have a mentoring component but that would not have to change if PSC did the approval. She suggested that the grant system should be more centralized.

- III. Dean Joyner wants a review of the faculty handbook. She was told to talk to Marvin Newman about inconsistencies but she believes the required changes are more substantive than could be handled by simple wording changes. For example, on one page, it says a visitor can be here for three years and on another page that a visitor can be here for six years. Dean Joyner is concerned that we could find ourselves with a de facto tenure situation. W. Brandon will contact Marvin Newman and Don Griffin about a committee. Changes then should be approved first by the PSC, then the executive committee, and finally by the faculty.
- IV. We need to set up a meeting for the review of grant applications. The Fyrst grant proposals are due on September 14. The first round of Ashforth and Critchfield applications are due September 28. The second round is due in January. All of at least the Ashforth and Critchfield applications must strictly adhere to the guidelines. Dean Joyner noted that there are four grant approving groups. One is for the Critchfield and Ashforth grants; another for the international grants; one for Cornell; and one for service learning grants. There is no application for Cornell. W. Brandon suggested that one of the guidelines for the grants we consider should be to force faculty to have an AFAR on file to qualify. Dean Joyner agreed and, as of January, that will be a requirement.
- V. The Executive Committee wants the PSC to clarify the roles of the informal and formal reviews for promotion and tenure. Dean Joyner commented that the informal review creates inconsistency across departments. A more formal process would ensure that no junior faculty is taken by surprise.
- VI. W. Brandon asked J. Carrington to follow up for the PSC when a recommendation gets approved by the faculty. We need to make sure the recommendation actually gets implemented in the by-laws.
- VII. Judy Schmalstig has asked this committee to consider a stop in tenure clock in cases of new parents or other caregiving needs. F. Harper will check on how other schools handle these cases.
- VIII. Other issues.
 - Dean Joyner asked if programs can hire faculty. Executive committee agrees that only a department can hire but then how is the evaluation handled?
 - De facto tenure and the length of visiting appointments are on the table. Dean Joyner points out that the handbook states that we follow AAUP guidelines but they are very liberal and if we don't want de facto tenure, that should be changed. She will get some data on the gap between what we say we want and the positions that are actually filled by adjuncts, visitors, etc. W. Brandon noted that a lecturer position could be made separate from the handbook issue. Some departments want to be able to have lecturer positions; others feel trapped by those positions that preclude them from getting faculty lines.

- F. Harper would like to consider the cases of promotion without tenure. This may be completely justified when we hire someone with experience but it is done with no input from the FEC and there is no standard procedure. A. Voicu will investigate procedures elsewhere and write up a policy.
4. The meeting was adjourned at 1:45 p.m. The next meeting is scheduled for October 2, 2007 at 12:30 p.m. in CSS 244.

Respectfully submitted by Julie Carrington.